

REMARKS

Status of Application

By the present Amendment, new claims 31-32 have been added. Claims 1-26 and 28-32 are all the claims pending in the application.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 24 has been allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6, 15-23, 25-26, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over US 6,354,688 to Inoue et al (hereinafter “Inoue”) in view of US 6,270,178 to Wada et al (hereinafter “Wada”) and further in view of US 6,582,048 to Akahira et al (hereinafter “Akahira”). Claims 7 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Wada and further in view of Akahira, as applied to claim 3 above, and in view of US 2002/0175962 to Otsuki (hereinafter “Otsuki”). Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Wada in view of Akahira and further in view of Otsuki, as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of US 6,692,097 to Arima et al (hereinafter “Arima”). Applicant respectfully traverses all of these rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Independent claim 1 recites (in part):

...printing ...a first one of the plurality of lines formed with a first one of the plurality of nozzles being adjacent to a second one of the plurality of lines formed with a second one of the plurality of nozzles, and a third one of the plurality of lines being formed with the first one of the plurality of nozzles...

(emphasis added)

In addition, claim 1 recites:

...wherein the correction values for the first one of the plurality of lines, the second one of the plurality of lines and the third one of the plurality of lines are stored respectively...

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Inoue, Wada, Akahira, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests the above features and, therefore, claim 1 is patentable over the cited references for at least these reasons.

For example, the Examiner acknowledges that Inoue and Wada fail to teach or suggest the features of printing a first one of the plurality of lines formed with a first one of the plurality of nozzles being adjacent to a second one of the plurality of lines formed with a second one of the plurality of nozzles, and a third one of the plurality of lines being formed with the first one of the plurality of nozzles, as recited in claim 1. Nevertheless, the grounds of rejection allege that Akahira remedies the deficient teachings of Inoue and Wada. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the grounds of rejection.

The grounds of rejection rely on Inoue's density correction table stored in the processing parameter storing device 16 as allegedly teaching the features of wherein the correction values for the first one of the plurality of lines, the second one of the plurality of lines and the third one of the plurality of lines are stored respectively, as claimed.

In sharp contrast to claim 1, however, Inoue teaches preparing a correction table for each of the recording elements (i.e., nozzles) (see e.g., Inoue, Abstract). Indeed, Inoue teaches "the density correction table of each raster (that is to say, the density correction table for each nozzle)

is formed by the density correction table preparing unit 24” (Inoue, column 7, lines 57-62). Thus, as taught in Inoue, correction values for the recording elements (i.e., nozzles) are stored, respectively.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that it would not have been obvious to modify Inoue with Wada and Akahira so that the processing parameter storing device 16 stores a correction value for the first one of the plurality of lines formed with the first one of the plurality of nozzles and a correction value for the third one of the plurality of lines formed with the first one of the plurality of nozzles.

Quite to the contrary, Applicant submits that if a correction value for the first one of the plurality of lines formed with the first one of the plurality of nozzles and a correction value for the third one of the plurality of lines formed with the first one of the plurality of nozzles were stored in Inoue, then it would be unclear as to which of the aforementioned two correction values is the respective correction value for the first one of the plurality of nozzles. Thus, the Examiner’s proposed modification to Inoue would render Inoue’s device unsatisfactory for its intended purpose (*see* MPEP §2143.01).

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that it would not have been obvious to modify the teachings of Inoue, with those of Wada and Akahira, so as to achieve claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over Inoue, Wada, Akahira, and any combination thereof. Further, the dependent claims 2-23 and 28-29 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

In view of the similarity between the requirements of claims 25-26 and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 demonstrate the patentability of claims 25-26. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claims 25-26 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

New Claims

By the present Amendment, new claims 31 and 32 have been added. Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 31 and 32 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 25 and 26, respectively, as well as by virtue of the similarity between recitations of claims 31 and 32 to those of allowable claim 24.

Accordingly, allowance of claims 31 and 32 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
Appln. No.: 10/576,493

Docket No: Q93289

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Andrew J. Taska /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Andrew J. Taska
Registration No. 54,666

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 20, 2010